




UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/869,031	10/16/2001	Mirna Rapp	0843.0002	7920
22852 7590 09/06/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER CARLSON, KAREN C	
			ART UNIT 1656	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of Abandonment

Application No.

09/869,031

Examiner

Karen Cochrane Carlson,
Ph.D.

Applicant(s)

RAPP, MIRNA

Art Unit

1656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

This application is abandoned in view of:

1. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on _____.
 - (a) ☐ A reply was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of _____ month(s)) which expired on _____.
 - (b) ☐ A proposed reply was received on _____, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection.
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).
 - (c) ☐ A reply was received on _____ but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).
 - (d) ☐ No reply has been received.
2. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (a) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$ _____ is insufficient. A balance of \$ _____ is due.
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ _____. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$ _____.
 - (c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.
3. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).
 - (a) ☐ Proposed corrected drawings were received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.
 - (b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.
4. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.
5. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.
6. ☒ The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on July 23, 2007 and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.
7. ☐ The reason(s) below:


KAREN COCHRANE CARLSON, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.

67/23/07

Paper 30

Mail Stop Interference
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450
Tel: 571-272-4683
Fax: 571-273-0042

Filed 23 July 2007

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

MIRNA RAPP
Junior Party
(Application 09/869,031),

v.

ARMIN PRASCH
and
BERNHARD LUY
Senior Party
(Patent 6,596,318).
Patent Interference No. 105,541)
(Technology Center 1600)

Judgment - Request for Adverse - Bd. R. 127(b)

Before: SCHAFER, TIERNEY, and MOORE Administrative Patent Judges.

MOORE, Administrative Patent Judge.

Junior Party Rapp has filed a request for entry of adverse judgment (Paper 25) against its claims which correspond to the Counts.

Upon consideration of the request, it is

ORDERED that judgment on priority as to Count 1 (Paper 1, page 4) is awarded against Junior Party Mirna Rapp.

FURTHER ORDERED that Junior Party Mirna Rapp is not entitled to a